



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,085	08/23/2001	Mikael Nilsson	34647-00438USPT	9906

27045 7590 06/17/2005

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR C11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/938,085

Applicant(s)

NILSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Bates

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

RD

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on February 10, 2005.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

The Affidavit was received February 10, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by O'Flaherty (6275824).

Regarding claim 1, O'Flaherty discloses a method for contacting an origin server from a user (Column 5, lines 30 – 46; Column 14, lines 58 – 65), comprising the steps of: generating a minimal user profile for the user, said minimal user profile containing user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile (Column 5, lines 30 – 46); determining if a privacy policy of the origin server at least meets privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); and providing at least one second user profile containing a more detailed

CPI to the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server at least meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claim 4, O'Flaherty discloses that the step of providing further comprises the step of providing the at least one second user profile containing the more detailed CPI in each request to the Origin Server (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claims 9 and 14, O'Flaherty discloses a wireless communications node associated with a user (Figure 1, elements 150, 140, and 102), comprising: a minimal user profile containing only user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); a second user profile containing a more detailed CPI (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); control logic for providing the minimal user profile to establish an initial connection to an origin server (Column 5, lines 30 – 46) and to provide the second user profile to the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claims 12 and 17, O'Flaherty discloses that the control logic attaches the second user profile to each request toward the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Leppinen (6735186).

Regarding claim 2, O'Flaherty discloses caching the minimal user profile within a trusted node between the origin server and the user (Column 4, lines 8 – 19), but O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the trusted node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session. Leppinen discloses a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Regarding claim 5, O'Flaherty discloses that the step of providing further comprises the steps of: caching the at least one second user profile (Column 4, lines 8 – 19; Column 15, lines 11 – 15) and using that profile to forward the information between the user and the origin server (Column 15, lines 11 – 15; Column 5, lines 30 – 46), but O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session. Leppinen discloses a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to

reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Regarding claim 6, O'Flaherty discloses a method for contacting an origin server from a user, comprising the steps of: generating a minimal user profile for the user, said minimal user profile containing user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); caching the minimal user profile within the a network node (Column 4, lines 8 – 19); establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile (Column 5, lines 30 – 46); determining if a privacy policy of the origin server meets privacy preferences of the user using the minimal user profile (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); and providing a second user profile containing a more detailed CPI in each subsequent request to the origin server if the privacy policy of the origin server at least meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 15, lines 11 – 15), but O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session. Leppinen discloses a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Regarding claims 13 and 18, O'Flaherty discloses that the control logic forwards the second user profile a single time for caching at a network node if the privacy policy of the origin server meets the privacy preferences of the user (Column 4, lines 8 – 19;

Art Unit: 2155

Column 15, lines 11 – 15), but O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session. Leppinen discloses a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55).

Claims 3, 10, 11, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Barrett (6581059).

Regarding claim 3, O'Flaherty discloses checking privacy requirements of the user and if the server fits those requirements allowing it access to a more detailed profile, but does not explicitly indicate that the step of determining further comprises the steps of: requesting a policy reference file and a privacy policy from the origin server; receiving the policy reference file and the privacy policy from the origin comparing the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user. Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from

the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the control logic requests the privacy policy of the origin server. Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the control logic compares the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user. Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining

private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Leppien as applied to claims 2, 5, 6, 13, and 18 above, and further in view of Barrett (6581059).

Regarding claim 7, O'Flaherty discloses checking privacy requirements of the user and if the server fits those requirements allowing it access to a more detailed profile, but does not explicitly indicate that the step of determining further comprises the steps of: requesting a policy reference file and a privacy policy from the origin server; receiving the policy reference file and the privacy policy from the origin comparing the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user. Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column

6, lines 30 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Regarding claim 8, O'Flaherty discloses a method for contacting an origin server from a user (Column 5, lines 30 – 46; Column 14, lines 58 – 65), comprising the steps of: generating a minimal user profile for the user, said minimal user profile containing user designated CPI (Column 4, lines 41 – 60); caching the minimal user profile within a network node (Page 15, Column 2, lines 43 – 61); establishing a connection with the origin server using the minimal user profile (Column 5, lines 30 – 46); providing the second user profile to a network node if the privacy policy of the origin server at least meets the privacy preferences of the user; caching the second user profile at the network node (Column 15, lines 11 – 15); and attaching the second user profile to all requests received from the user and forwarded to the origin server (Column 4, lines 8 – 19; Column 15, lines 11 – 15), but O'Flaherty does not explicitly indicate that the network node is a WAP gateway, and the profile it cached while establishing a WSP session or requesting a policy reference file and a privacy policy from the origin server receiving the policy reference file and the privacy policy from the origin server; comparing the privacy policy of the origin server with the privacy preferences of the user

to determine if a privacy policy of the origin server meets privacy preferences of the user. Leppinen discloses a wireless network system in which a user sends a profile to a WAP gateway when establishing a WSP session (Column 3, lines 39 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Leppinen's teaching of caching the profile at the WAP gateway, in O'Flaherty's system in order to reduce the communications needed between a user, a gateway, and a server (Column 1, lines 44 – 55). Barrett teaches a system for providing personal information to an origin server that includes receiving a request from the origin server about obtaining private information (Column 6, lines 19 – 20), getting a policy reference file and privacy policy from the server (Column 6, lines 20 – 27), and comparing that privacy information with user preferences (Column 6, lines 30 – 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Barrett's teaching of obtaining privacy policy from the origin server in a way that the user device can compare that policy to the user requirements/preferences before disclosing more information about the private user information in O'Flaherty in order to allow the privacy information to be available to qualified sources at all times and be hidden from unqualified sources (Column 2, lines 10 – 36).

Response to Arguments

Claims 1-18 have been rejected in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by the Affidavit filed February 10, 2005.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 6317718 issued to Fano, because it discloses dynamically updating a user profile.

U. S. Patent No. 5711682 issued to Capps, because it discloses automatically creating an anonymous account for users who wish to maintain privacy.

U. S. Patent No. 6253203 issued to O'Flaherty, because it discloses creating a profile based on the level of security based on user preferences given to the access of the data.

U. S. Patent Application Publication no. 2002/0147766 issued to Vanska, because it discloses having profile access levels based on privacy levels.

U. S. Patent no. 6480850 issued to Velhuisen, because it discloses a database with privacy requirements based on user preferences.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB
June 9, 2005

Philip Tran
PHILIP TRAN (PSA)